

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 24-49 were pending in the Application prior to the present Amendment, with Claims 24-41 being withdrawn from consideration. Claims 42-49 were rejected in the Office Action. Applicants cancel previously withdrawn Claims 24-41, amend Claims 42-49 and respectfully request a reconsideration of the rejections. Claims 42-49 are pending after the present Amendment. Specification of the Application has been amended to make the specification consistent with Figs. 6-8 of the Application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 42-43 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants corrected the language of Claims 42-49 and respectfully submits that these claims now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 42 and 45 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strebel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,510,233). Claims 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strebel et al. in view of Upchurch (U.S. Patent No. 4,846,218).

Claim 42, as amended, recites a pump with a detachable connecting assembly 100, 101 positioned at the working medium access bore of the pump. See, Figs. 6-7 of the Application. The connecting assembly has at least one pair of sealing surfaces 117. The first sealing surface of the pair 117 is dome-shaped and convex, and the second sealing surface is concave conical and non-complementary to the first sealing surface, as shown in more detail in Figs. 8, 9 and 10. Because the first and second sealing surfaces are non-complementary, they contact each other only along at least one annular contact line, and not along the entire area of either one of the sealing surfaces. In other words, as shown in the cross-sectional drawings, there are discrete points of contact between the first and second sealing surfaces, these discrete points forming the annular contact line.

Contrary to the above recitation of the amended Claim 42, Strebel discloses a pump structure having sealing inserts 66 with either a flat-flat pair of sealing surfaces 67 or a complementary lense-shaped pair of sealing surfaces 68. See, Strebel, col. 5, lines 31-40, and Fig. 2. Further, as shown in Fig. 2 of Strebel, sealing surfaces 67 and 68 contact each other along the entire area of both sealing surfaces. Therefore, the above limitations of Claim 42 are not disclosed or even suggested by Strebel. Accordingly, Claim 42 is allowable over the Strebel.

Claims 43 and 44 depend from Claim 42. Therefore, Claims 43 and 44 incorporate the above-discussed limitations of Claim 42. Upchurch does not remedy the deficiency of Strebel. Therefore, Claims 43 and 44 are allowable over the Strebel reference even in combination with Upchurch at least for the same reasons as Claim 42, and further, on their own merits.

Claims 42, 46 and 47 were also rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whiteman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,841,092). Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman et al. in view of Bardenheuer (U.S. Patent No. 1,586,278). Claim 49 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman et al. in view of Yotam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,595,495).


Similarly to Strebel, Whiteman discloses a pump device with complementary sealing surfaces. Specifically, the pump device of Whiteman includes sealing members 46 and 52 having “mating” conical surfaces preventing leakage of the liquid. See, Whiteman, col. 4, lines 15-20 and 32-34, and Fig. 1. Accordingly, Whiteman does not disclose or even suggest the limitations of Claim 42 requiring that the second sealing surface is non-complementary to the first sealing surfaces and that the sealing surfaces form an annular contact line without contacting each other along the entire area of either surface. Neither Bardenheuer nor Yotam remedy this deficiency of Whiteman.

Therefore, Claim 42 is allowable over the cited prior art. Moreover, Claims 43-49 depend from Claim 42. Therefore, Claims 43-49 are allowable at least for the same reasons as Claim 42 and, further, on their own merits.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING  
SYSTEM ON October 6, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:AV:db